

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 04-1823

SHIRLEY F. DANIELS,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

DONALD H. RUMSFELD, Secretary of Defense,

Defendant - Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern
District of Virginia, at Newport News. Jerome B. Friedman,
District Judge. (CA-03-60-4)

Submitted: February 18, 2005

Decided: March 8, 2005

Before WILLIAMS, GREGORY, and SHEDD, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Thomas F. Hennessy, III, THOMAS F. HENNESSY, P.C., Norfolk,
Virginia, for Appellant. Paul J. McNulty, United States Attorney,
Virginia Van Valkenburg, Assistant United States Attorney, Norfolk,
Virginia, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.
See Local Rule 36(c).

PER CURIAM:

Shirley F. Daniels appeals a district court's order granting summary judgment to her employer on her retaliation claim under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. This court reviews a grant of summary judgment de novo. Higgins v. E.I. DuPont de Nemours & Co., 863 F.2d 1162, 1167 (4th Cir. 1988). Summary judgment is appropriate only if there are no material facts in dispute and the moving party is entitled to judgment as a matter of law. Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(c); Celotex Corp. v. Catrett, 477 U.S. 317, 322 (1986). This court must view the evidence in the light most favorable to the non-moving party. Anderson v. Liberty Lobby, Inc., 477 U.S. 242, 255 (1986).

We have reviewed the parties' briefs, the joint appendix, and the district court's opinion, and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm the judgment of the district court. See Daniels v. Rumsfeld, No. CA-03-60-4 (E.D. Va. June 3, 2004). We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED